THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ROOMMATE SATISFACTION AND PERSONALITY TYPE

AS MEASURED BY THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

Appalachian State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Margaret T. Wentworth

July 1978

Approved by

_____
Chairman, Thesis Committee

_____
Associate Professor of Psychology

_____
Assistant Professor of Psychology

_____
Chairman, Department of Psychology

_____
Dean of the Graduate School

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank the three members of my committee, DuMont Schmidt, Joan Walls, and Hank Schneider for all the help they were to me in completing this research paper: DuMont for his help in generating ideas and cheering me up when I was frustrated and discouraged; Joan for her help in organization and sentence structure and continuous words of encouragement; and Hank for his help in the statistical and computer work as well as his ideas on what had to be included in various sections.

I also wish to thank Peter Petschauer for his willingness to let me use the students of Watauga College in this study and his assistance in collecting the data.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether similarity of personality types was significantly related to roommate satisfaction. The population used was 54 female and 44 male freshmen and sophomore students enrolled in a cluster college at Appalachian State Univeristy. At the befinning of the semester all the students took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Similarity scores were computed using both dicthomous and continuous scores. At the end of the semester a two part questionnaire was administered to the students. In part one the roommates answered 26 questions indicating how frequently they experienced certain problems with their roommates. From this the Behavioral Problem score was obtained. In part two, the roommates rated the extent to which 32 personality characteristics, derived from the MBTI, described themselves and their roommate. A perceived similarity score was obtained from these responses. This part of the questionnaire also showed how much the perceived personality similarity, positively or negatively affed the roommate relationship. From these responses a Perceptual Problem score was obtained. The Behavioral and Perceptual Problem scores were used as the measure of roommate satisfaction.

Anovas and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were computed. These significant dfferences were obtained when using the MBTI score and the Perceptual Problem score:

1. Roommates who share opposite auxiliary functions tend to be more satisfied than those who share the same auxiliary.

2. Roommates who share one, two, or three preferences tend to be more satisfied than those who share zero or four.

3. Roommates who are similar as measured by continuous scores tend to be more satisfied than those who are dissimilar.

When using the perceived similarity score as the independent variable, there was evidence from both Behavioral and Perceptual Problem scores that

those who perceive themselves to be similar are more satisfied. The overall conclusion is that a perceived similarity in personality is a more crucial factor in assessing roommate satisfaction than an objective measure of similarity such as the MBTI.

One major concern on college campuses is how to insure that students obtain as much satisfaction as possible out of their college experience. One primary desire is for there to be academic satisfaction and achievement which many believe is influenced by the students satisfaction in activities outside of the classroom (social events, sporting activities, etc.) and in their living conditions. Living arrangements involve units such as dormitory floors, suites, sorority or fraternity houses, cooperative houses, or apartments. Within these units the students usually share a room with one person. There have been many studies done which have tried to discover what variables influence the satisfaction of the people in the same unit and of roommates. The variable this study plans to use is a personality variable; the Jungian typology as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. If there are significant differences in the satisfaction of certain types being paired by this typology as compared to those randomly assigned, colleges could use this information to help place people in a living situation which would increase the chances for satisfaction.

Background and Theory

This study will use a typology because it offers a structure within which to look at the differences and similarities between roommates. Typologies allow for the classification of people into broad categories and at the same time allow for individual differences within the categories. There are many typologies used to describe personality differences. For example typologies have been developed by Kretschmer-Sheldon, Heymans-Wiersma, Spranger, and Jung. The Kretschmer-Sheldon theory says man can be classified by physique and temperament; Heymans-Wiersma by behaviors; and

Spranger by values. Carl Jung concentrates on man's orientation toward the world and his preferred mode of functioning.

The Myers-Briggs Indicator

Since this study is using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which was developed to identify Jungian types, it is necessary to discuss Jung's ideas in more depth. According to Jung, a person prefers to relate to the outer world of objects and people or to the inner world of ideas. If the person prefers the outer orientation his preference is called extraversion (E), while the preference for the inner world is called introversion (I). If a person has an E preference it means he will prefer that orientation and use it more often. It does not mean he operates only as an extravert; at times he will prefer to function as an introvert.

In addition to having an orientation toward the world, each person has a preferred way of functioning. For Jung there are two types of functioning: nonrational and rational. Nonrational functioning refers to the manner in which a person receives information. If is called nonrational functioning because the person simply becomes aware of the information and does not process it. When the processing begins then he is using one of his rational functions. Nonrational functioning can be done either by sensing (S) or intuition (N). If a person prefers to receive information through his five senses, he prefers the sensing function. On the other hand, if a person prefers to receive information more from unconscious material which produces insights, hunches, and intuitions, he is using his intuitive function. Rational functioning refers to the processing of information. The two types of rational functions are thinking (T)

and feeling (F). Processing within a logical, objective framework characterizes the thinking function. Using subjective values to process information characterizes the feeling mode. According to Jung it is not possible to use S and N or T and F simultaneously on a conscious level. He contended for example, that if a person is consciously and consistently using his S function then his N function is operating at an unconscious level. Jung further stated that the conscious use of S will result in its being more fully developed and useful than its opposite, N. S would be called the dominant function. As a support to the dominant function, a person develops an auxiliary function. This auxiliary function comes from the other mode. In other words, if the dominant function is S (nonrational) then the auxiliary must be either T of F (rational). Unlike the highly developed dominant function and its opposite which is likely to be underdeveloped, the auxiliary function and its opposite are more likely to be equally developed, especially in people over 40 (This is still a tentative hypothesis and has not been researched.).

Putting all this together, a person can be classified as one of 16 types:

	orientation	dominant function	auxiliary function
ESF	E	S	F
ENT	E	N	T
ENF	E	N	F
EST	E	T	S
ENT	E	T	N
ESF	E	F	S
EST	E	S	T

	orientation	dominant function	auxiliary function
ENF	E	F	N
IST	I	S	T
ISF	I	S	F
INT	I	N	T
INF	I	N	F
IST	I	T	S
INT	I	T	N
ISF	I	F	S
INF	I	F	N

To help identify which function is dominant, Myers and Briggs created another category. This categorizing identifies the person's preference for using his nonrational, information gathering functions, or his preference for using his rational, decision making, information sharing functions. Chosing the nonrational (S or N) shows a preference for perception (P) while choosing the rational (T or F) shows a preference for judgment (J). This preference is always related to how the person prefers to relate to the outer world. Since the P or J tells you whether or not the person prefers to use his nonrational or rational function in relating to the outer world, it also reveals which function is dominant. For the extravert the dominant function is the one used to relate to the outer world so the P or J preference indicates which function is the dominant function. For example in ESTP the nonrational is preferred so S is the dominant function and T the auxiliary.

For an I who is most interested in the inner world, the dominant function is used internally and the auxiliary is used to relate to the outer world. The P or J will point out the auxiliary. For example in ISTP, the nonrational is the auxiliary so S is auxiliary and T dominant; in ISTJ, the rational function is auxiliary so T is auxiliary and S is dominant. For further descriptions of types read the MBTI Manual (Myers, 1962) pages 51-76.

Ms. Myers and Ms. Briggs began construction of the MBTI in 1942. Up to this time most of the identification of types was done by Jungian therapists using the information gathered from the verbal reports and dreams of their clients. The MBTI was developed in hopes that an objective instrument could effectively identify the type preferences. It has been subjected to many revisions and the present form that is used is the F form. It contains 166 forced choice items which are of two types. In one type, the items are prefaced by a phrase which introduces the choice. For example "when you go somewhere for the day, would you rather

A. plan what you will do and when

B. just go."

In the second type, one is simply asked to pick which word appeals to you more. For example:

"A. literal   B. figurative."

A response can give a person points on only one preference E, I, S, N, T, F, P, or J. The person receives one or two points for a preference. Two points are given if the answer is one which has a high frequency of being chosen by people with the same preference and low frequency of being chosen by people with the opposite preference.

Reliability and Validity of MBTI. Much work has been done to test the reliability and validity of this instrument. Numerous studies of the reliability of all scales have been conducted which used split-half procedures. The results of these studies show the reliability to be for E-I, .77 to .87; for S-N, .70 to .87; for T-F, .44 to .86; and for P-J, .71 to .94 (Myers, 1962). Stricker and Ross (1963) found continuous scores to have internal consistency reliaiblity of .64 to .84 but only .34 to .74 for dichotomous scores. They contend that the lower reliability for dichotomous scores may have resulted because they used a lower bound reliability estimate.

Extensive work has been done in the area of validity. In the Manual (Myers, 1962) the results of many studies are cited which show there is a correlation on appropriate scales of other tests which support the constructs of the orientations and functions (page 16-40). Some of these are Allport-Vernon-Lindsey's Study of Values, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Strong Campbell Interest Blank, Terman Concept Test, scholastic performance, and dropout rates on jobs and in colleges. Backing these results, Grant (Note 1) found, in a study involving 1413 freshman students at Auburn University in Alabama, that summary descriptions that were compiled from an 85 item questionnaire concerning students' behaviors and attitudes were similar to the descriptions of types presented in the MBTI Manual. However, Stricker and Ross (1964) think that E-I and J-P do not necessarily evaluate Jung's ideas. They contend there are one or more equally plausible interpretations of what the scales mean. These alternative interpretations, which are outside of the Jungian typology, satisfactorily account for many

of the proper.ties and correlates of the scales (page 623). Ross, Mendelsohn, and Gerard (in Sundberg, 1965) claim E-I scale measures a popular construct (social verses nonsocial), not a Jungian one. In another study conducted by Ross (Note 2), he found that the four scales on MBTI reflect "surface characteristics other than the typological differences for which they were constructed" (Ross's summary). This study used scores of high school students on 32 tests, including 15 ability tests, 7 experimental interest tests and 10 scales taken from the Personality Research Inventory. Even if one is not inclined to accept the constructs as measuring Jungian ideas, Myers (1962) contends the instrument is valid in measuring those preferences she describes in the Manual on page 51-76.

Another question about the MBTI concerns the interaction of the different categories. Myers claims that only the J-P scales correlate consistently (show some dependence) with any other scale. That scale is the S-N one with intuitives correlating with perceptive more than what would be expected by chance (.20 to .47) (Myers, 1962, page 11). Rechek (1969) disagrees somewhat with these results and states he found a correlation between T-F and J-P scales. The reason for this may be his restricted sample: upper division education majors.

Use of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in Research. There are two questions about the best way to use MBTI for research. The first is whether or not dichotomous or continuous scores should be used. Stricker and Ross (1964) summarize Jung's belief that the types are categorical or qualitatively dichotomous and the extent to which the type is actually developed is a continuous variable but type per se is categorical. Stricker, Schiffman,

and Ross (1965) used the contingency table procedure in assessing MBTI ability to predict freshman grade point average and dropout rate, concluded that interdependent, dichotomous type categories generally had greater predictive validity than did continuous scores. Myers also supports the use of dichotomous scores (1962, pages 17-20, 37, and 109). Dichotomous scores have been used in a variety of research areas such as orientation toward privacy (Marshall, 1971); couples responses to marital enrichment groups (Neville, 1972); behavioral changes as the result of being in small groups (Grass, 1971); the interaction of perceptual discrimination, and aesthetic preference (Gerard, 1968); teacher's preferences in classroom organizational climate (Collins, 1966); the relationships between supervising teachers and students teacher (Hoffman, 1975); and a brief method for assessing a social-personal orientation (Carlson and Levy, 1968).

On the other hand, Siegel (1963) says that continuous scores should be used in order to maintain reliability and validity. He finds no convincing evidence of bimodality. Sundberg (1965) states that the Educational Testing Service has been using continuous scores since 1962 and is still in the process of doing extensive norming and revising by internal-consistency methods. Even Myers sights research which uses continuous scores to support the validity of the Indicator. Continuous scores have been used when only separate preferences are being considered. Two examples of these are Poe's study (1968) on assessment of Heath's model of personality and Rechek's (1969) study on intercorrelations of scales. Another way to use continuous scores is to consider total type preference. When doing this a global

similarity score is obtained. Mendelsohn (1962, 1963, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968), has studied similarity between clients and counselor. Garrison (1970) investigated the similarity between students, peers, and professors using global similarity scores. Because of the above issue, both continuous and dichotomous scores will be analyzed in this study.

The second question relates to Jung's contention that various attitudes and functions, when taken in combination, tend to modify each other and produce unique effects. If this is accepted then the researcher must consider only total types. This had not been done in the past because many researchers have considered just the function preferences or the orientation preferences. Bourchard (1969) makes this statement:

Since components of the typology represent psychological processes
underlying the individual's choices, it is possible to "break up"
the type patterns for a given research purpose by examining the
type patterns for a given research purpose by examining components which are theoretically important in the immediate context.

In this study both functional preferences (N-S and T-F) and total type preferences will be considered.

Studies of Roommate Satisfaction

Having considered the independent variable, the MBTI we will now consider the research which had been done on roommate satisfaction. This research had dealt with roommates, both as part of large groups and as dyads. These studies have related satisfaction to design of territory, academic variables, demographic variables, and personality variables.

Studies of Residence Hall Groupings

Brown (1968) manipulated freshman residence halls so that floors were numerically dominated by students with similar academic majors. The ratio of science to humanity students was four to one on two floors and one to four on the other. A significantly greater proportion of minority groups changed their majors to field similar to those of the majority groups and minority students expressed more dissatisfaction with residence hall life. Other studies show that using homogeneous or congruent grouping procedures in residence halls has resulted in increased academic acheivement and greater satisfaction with living environment (Decoster, 1966 and 1968; Snead and Cople, 1971). West (in Schroeder, 1977) found if male student's floors were allowed a group room which the residents could personalize and control according to their needs and desires, there was more concern for other; more emphasis on open and honest communication and academic accomplishments; and that the students obtained higher grade point averages than freshman males living on floors without group rooms. Arnold (1974) found with the women he studied that personality similarity made a positive difference in a cooperative housing setting, a negative difference in a sorority and no significant difference in two residence halls. A positive difference meant that the roommates received a higher rating by peers on a stability scale which defined a stable relationship as one which is "satisfactory and enduring." He believes that higher ratings were obtained not so much because of common traits or relative harmony but because of the quality of the interactions between the people.

For students living in suites, it was found that the members had an overall similarity when they started living together in the fall and that when they were retested in the spring the degree of similarity was positively associated with greater satisfaction with suite living experience (Pierce and Schwartz, 1974). They found the most relevant variables to consider when grouping people in suites were financial and academic achievement, relationship to parents and independence, and political and religious involvement.

Some studies involving residence hall groupings have used the MBTI results as one of the independent variables. A special men's dormitory program was initiated at Auburn University to help students develop their four functions (S, N, T, F) (Schroeder, Note 3). One way they did this was to place students on a floor with other students who had the same dominant function. These floor units had 9-30 members. Roommates were paired so dominant functions were the same, and auxiliaries different. They were also engaged in complimentary areas of study. With these manipulations, the dormitories in question had a 30% increase in occupancy, 78% decline in building damages, and a record high 72% retention from Spring to Fall quarter.

In another study Schroeder (1977) paired engineering students according to identical dominant and opposite auxiliary functions. They were divided into two groups. The first group lived in experimental living-learning center with other engineering students and the second group lived in other dorms where there were students majoring in diverse curricula. The Expectancy and Reality forms of the University Residence Environment Scale

(Gerst and Moos, 1972) were used to evaluate the differences in environmental perceptions between the two groups. The living-learning group scored significantly higher than the other group on involvement, emotional support, and intellectuality scales. No discussion was made about any effects of the pairing using the MBTI. In a similar study done by Eigenbrod (1969) at Michigan State University, it was found that students who were allowed to decorate and change their physical surrounding in any way desired, thereby delineating their territory (room and floor), had significantly higher ratings on room and roommate satisfaction than control subjects (lived in a regular dormitory setting).

In summary, some studies show that grouping students by academic interest, similar personality traits or other homogeneous categories and allowing students to organize and personalize their territory (dormitory floor) has resulted in higher academic acheivement, retention in school and dormitory, and more satisfying relationships with group members be they in the same sorority, on the same floor, in the same suite or sharing the same room.

Studies of Residence Hall Dyads

One study which dealt with the physical environment of roommates (Rohner, 1974) found that roommates in a men's dormitory who had bunk beds ratherthan twin beds chose new roommates less frequently. Rohner suggests the critical difference was the relatively greater living space and visual privacy in rooms with bunk beds.

In the area of academics, Decoster (1966) found that high ability students got better grades when assigned to living units with high concentration of high ability students, but average students in these units obtained lower grades than students assigned randomly. Naster (1963) found that there was a higher failure rate for students grouped heterogeneously (non-academic oriented with academically oriented) than those grouped homogeneously. Pace (1968), using Nudd Roommate Checklist, grade point average, The College and University Environmental Scales, and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, found highly dissatisfied roommates had significantly lower scholastic achievement than satisfied roommates. Crew and Giblette (1965) found that roommates having one course in common did marginally better on academic performance than those who did not. In a study at the University of California (Nudd, 1965), it was found that satisfied roommates group scores were significantly higher than unsatisfied roommate group scores when paired by like academic majors.

On the other hand Elton and Bates (1966), Beal and Williams, Schoemer and McConnell, and Moushema (in Williams and Reilley, 1972) studied the interaction of grades and roommates paired by academic majors. They found no significant difference in grade achievement in groups of freshman, between those paired with the same majors and those paired with different majors. Schmidt and Sedlacek (Note 4) in a study at the University of Maryland found no relationship between homogeneity of roommate pairs and academic performance. The roommates were compared on ACT scores, whether they were in the same college (area of study) and their educational orientation as evaluated by the University Student Census. In Broxton's study (1970), he found that having similar GPA and scholastic majors did not significantly influence roommate satisfaction. However, Hall and Wellerman (in Gehring,

1970) found students who were high in school rank were more likely to stay together than others of lower rank. Gehring (1970) says that GPA may affect satisfaction but is not a sufficient criteria.

Broxton (1970) found the following demographic characteristics contributed to roommate satisfaction between female roommates: similarity in church attendance, personal approval of drinking and smoking, father's education and annual salary, size of graduating class, number of study hours, practice of studying with radio or record player, and habit of sleeping with the window up. However Gehring (1970), in a study involving freshman men, stated that father's education, the size of the high school, church attendance and smoking habits, "although are possibly necessary for compatibility, are not sufficient determinants" (author's abstract). Nudd (1965) found more satisfaction when people were paired with those who were similar in age and year in school, had common interests and came from the same size hometown. Scheidt and Smith (1976) found that when roommates had compatible birth order, there was less interpersonal conflict then when they were incompatiable. Compatible birth order would occur when there was no conflict in rank and sex; eg. oldest of sisters paired with youngest of sisters. Incompatible would be oldest of sisters paired with oldest of brothers. Interpersonal conflict was defined in terms of controversy, disagreements, and argumentativeness.

In terms of personality variables, the Nudd study (1965) found dissatisfaction if there was a large difference in scores on the economic and religious scales of the Study of Values Inventory. Using the Edwards Personal Preference Scale, Pace (1968) found satisfied roommates had higher

difference scores on the abasement scale. He also found that satisfied roommates saw the college (Colorado State College) as exhibiting more awareness and propriety characteristics (The College and University Environmental Scales). When considering relationships between adjustment (socio-emotional) and personality similarity, Tellem (1969) found a low positive correlation between compatibility and adjustment. When roommates mutually chose each other, this correlation was higher than if they were randomly assigned.

Another area that had been studied is conflict and its relationship to roommate satisfaction. Wheaton (1974) found that principle conflicts with-our regard to source of issue had significant negative effect on cohesiveness of roommate pairs, whereas communal conflicts had a positive effect. Also that the degree of conflict itself, unclassified as to type and source or issue, was unrelated to level of cohesiveness. Principle conflicts were defined as conflicts involving differences in values, code of ethics or basic truths, while communal conflicts were defined as conflicts involving behavior on how to practice shared principles. In another study which considered conflict, Pierce (1970) concluded that one possibility is that, "conflict around values my tend to be more useful than conflicts around needs, and that optimum growth and health can be acheived by matching roommates to be compatible on needs but different as to values."

Broxton (1970), Nudd (1965) and Kelly (1941) all found in their studies of dyads (Broxton and Nudd, roommates; Kelly, married couples) that perception was a key factor. Broxton said that interpersonal attraction varied more directly with perceived similarity than objective similarity

when adjusted by a correction factor. Nudd said that the most significant variable in roommate satisfaction was what each roommate expected of the other and how much the roommates acted according to the expectation. Kelly found that perceived differences were more operative in martial stability than were tested differences.

Grass (1971) in a study at Michigan State University used two groups of students: those paired with identical dominant functions and different auxiliary functions (measured by the MBTI) and a control group. He found that on the Omnibus Personality Inventory the first group increased on impulse expression but there was no significant difference in change between groups on any other dimension. A study of 281 college students whose compatibility was measured according to their similarity (degree to which basic functions were shared) as measured by the MBTI found that those who were similar types had the highest satisfactory ratings (Eigenbrod, 1969). The degree of satisfaction was determined by a questionnaire which measured satisfaction with room and roommate assignment, number of requests for room and roommate change and disciplinary difficulties incurred.

In summary, studies assert that grouping of roommates according to educational orientation, gradepoint average, and majors makes a difference in academic performance and roommate satisfaction while some studies question these conclusions. Other studies have shown that certain physical conditions such as bunk beds, group room, and the freedom to decorate rooms did positively effect satisfaction. Similar interests, values, age, year in school, size of hometown, scores on religious and economic scales of Study of Values,

number of study hours, father's education, church attendence, study habits involving music, and birth order have been correlated significantly with roommate satisfaction. Studies using MBTI have shown that similar types have highest satisfaction and that pairing roommates with same dominant and opposite auxiliary may result in higher satisfaction. Another contention is that roommate expectation and perception of how the other "should" and "do" act affect satisfaction. Pierce and Schwartz (1974) say that the evidence supports these three statements:

a. People choose to associate with those like themselves.

b. People are most satisfied with those like themselves.

c. People tend to become like those with whom they associate.

Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, this study will address itself to the first two of these statements.

Statement of the Problem

The only studies done with roommate pairs using the MBTI have paired students so that they have the same dominant functions and opposite auxiliary functions. This pairing does seem to have contributed to roommate satisfaction but since there were other independent variables involved, no definite conclusion has been drawn specifically about the effect of this pairing. This study will investigate

a. if pairing of dominant and auxiliary functions relate to reported problems and roommate satisfaction

b. if different combinations of total type pairing relate to reported problems among roommates

c. if perception of one's roommate as being similar contributes to roommate satisfaction.

Hypotheses

Some comments are needed to explain the choice of hypotheses. It was previously stated that there is a controversy over whether scores on the MBTI should be treated as bimodial or continuous. Since there is no definite answer to this question, both bimodial and continuous scores will be used. Hypotheses one, two, and three will use bimodial scores, taking into account only the preference (functional or total) and not the strength of the preference. Hypothesis four will use continuous scores so that the strength of the preference will be considered. Hypothesis five is being considered because of the results of three other studies where perceptions seem to be the critical factor (Kelly, 1941; Broxton, 1970; and Nudd, 1965).

The hypotheses are as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of sharing dominant and/or auxiliary functions. The groups to be studied will be

    a. pairs with both dominant and auxiliary the same

    b. pairs with dominants the same and auxiliaries different

    c. pairs with dominants different and auxiliaries the same

    d. pairs with dominants and auxiliaries different.

2. There will be no significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of the number of functions shared by roommates. The groups to be studied will be

    a. those who share two functions

    b. those who share one function

    c. those who share zero functions.

3. There will not be a significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of preferences shared.

4. There will be no significant correlation between roommate satisfaction and similarity of types as measured by continuous global similarity score.

5. There will be no significant correlation between roommate satisfaction and perceived similarity between roommates.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 89 freshmen, eight sophomores, and one junior residents of Watauga College. Watauga College is an interdisciplinary cluster college which is part of Appalachian State University. Any entering freshman or transfer student may choose to be a member of this college as long as there are spaces (250) available. The students all resided in a coed dormitory with sections of floors occupied by males or females. Of the 98 subjects, 54 were female and 44 males. Roommates were randomly assigned before classes began unless there had been a special request. At the end of the second week of classes there was a roommate switch day at which time any person could switch roommates. Another such day occurred before the administering of the questionnaire. The roommates that were in existence from November 28 - December 10, 1977 were used in this study. Of these

59 were randomly assigned and 39 chose their roommate. 82 said they had been with this roommate all semester, 14 had been together two to three months, and two had been together less than two full months.

Instruments

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was given to all the students the first week of school. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was given to each person during the last week of November or the first week of December. Any person who was not present for the group administration of the questionnaire was contacted individually and asked to fill out the questionnaire. Consent forms (see Appendix B) were filled out by each individual.

The questionnaire had two parts: (1) Roommate Behavioral Problems and (2) a. Characteristic Perceptions and b. Perceptual Problems. Part one asked the students to indicate the extent to which 26 problems occurred with their roommate. The material for these questions came from problem lists submitted by Watauga resident hall assistants and from studies discussed in the Introduction. Besides these 26 questions, there were 13 other questions which dealt with the length of time dyads had been roommates; whether the pair chose each other; age, sex, and year in school; number of roommates the person had this semester; overall evaluation of the roommate; overall satisfaction with dormitory and college experience; and whether or not the person would chose to live with this roommate again. The ratings in this part which was called the Behavioral Problems go from a (never) to e (almost all the time).

Part two of the questionnaire had two sections. In section (a) the students were asked to rate how much 32 personality descriptions applied to themselves and then to do the same rating on their roommate. These 32 items, which were obtained by extracting descriptive words from the MBTI, contained four items for each of the eight preferences. The ratings in this section went from a (never) to e (all the time). In section (b) the students were asked to rate how much the perceived similarity or difference between themselves and their roommates affected their relationship. Here the scale ranged from a (positive effect) to e (negative effect).

Procedure

Scoring. The scoring procedures for the MBTI can be found in the Manual. Dichotomous scores were used for hypotheses one, two, and three. A functional similarity score for hypothesis two was determined by assigning the numbers 0, 1, or 2 to each person in the pair according to how many functions they had in common, eg. ENFP and ENTP would each be assigned the number 1 because they share only the N function. (Each person has four preferences of which the middle two are called functions.) A preference similarity score for hypothesis three was determined by assigning the number 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 to each person in the pair according to how many preferences the roommates had in common, eg. in an ENFP and INTP pair, each was assigned the number 2 because they had an N and P in common.

Continuous scores were used when dealing with hypothesis four and a global similarity score was determined by taking the absolute difference between the roommates on each preference then totaling these differences.

For example:

	E-I	S-N	T-F	J-P
Roommate one's scores	113	95	137	117
Roommate two's scores	105	141	113	109
Global Similarity score	8	+ 46	+ 24	+ 8 = 86

For hypothesis five the Perceived Similarity score measured the sum of the differences between the students ratings of themselves and their roommates on personality characteristics extracted from the MBTI. It was determined by subtracting the score an individual gave his roommate from the score each gave oneself (see the first two columns of the second part of the questionnaire) (Appendix A) then summing the absolute value of these differences. Low scores indicated that the person perceived himself as being similar to his roommate while high difference scores indicated that the person perceived himself and his roommate to be different.

Two problem scores were computed for each hypothesis. A Behavioral Problem score was computed by adding up all the scores obtained on the first 26 items in part one of the questionnaire for each roommate.

A Perceptual Problem score was computed by summing all the scores in column three of part two of the questionnaire. For the problem scores, high numbers indicated a high frequency of problems and suggest the degree to which differences were perceived as problems.

Statistics

For hypothesis one, two two-way analyses of variance were done using the two problem scores as the dependent variables. The independent

variable was the similarity or difference of the dominant and auxiliary functions as measured by the MBTI. Each roommate's score was placed in one of the following groups depending upon whether the roommates had

1. both dominant and auxiliary functions the same

2. dominant functions the same and auxiliary functions different

3. dominant functions different and auxiliary functions the same

4. both dominant and auxiliary functions different

For hypothesis two, two one-way analyses of variance were computed using the number of shared functions as the independent variable and the two problem scores as the dependent variables. The resulting groups consisted of

1. those who shared two functions with their roommate

2. those who shared one function with their roommate

3. those who shared zero functions with their roommate.

For hypothesis three, two one-way analyses of variance were computed using the number of shared preferences (functions plus E-I and J-P preferences) as the independent variable and the two problem scores as the dependent variables. The resulting groups consisted of

1. those who shared four preferences with their roommate

2. those who shared three preferences with their roommate

3. those who shared two preferences with their roommate

4. those who shared one preference with their roommate

5. those who shared zero preferences with their roommate.

For hypothesis four, two Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were calculated between

    1. global similarity score and Behavioral Problem score

    2. global similarity score and Perceptual Problem score.

    For hypothesis five, two Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were calculated between

    1. perceived similarity score and Behavioral Problem score

    2. perceived similarity score and Perceptual Problem score.

Results

Each hypothesis will be presented separately. For each of the first four hypothesis the independent variables are obtained from the MBTI scores. For all five hypotheses the dependent variables are the two problem scores obtained from the questionnaire. These scores are used to measure roommate satisfaction. The Behavioral Problem score measures how behaviors and attitudes affect roommate satisfaction and the Perceptual Problem score measures the degree to which perceived personality differences between roommates affect roommate satisfaction.

Hypothesis One

There will be no significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of sharing dominant and/or auxiliary functions.

In this hypothesis only the similarity or difference in dominant and auxiliary functions is used in establishing the independent variable. Tables one and two give the results of the two 2X2 analyses of variance using these functions and the two problem scores.

Table 1

Anova Summary Using Similarity of Function and the Behavioral Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Dominant function similarity	1	1.664	.008
Auxiliary function similarity	1	142.670	.688
2-Way interaction of dominant and auxiliary functions	1	45.351	.219
Error	93	207.234	

Table 2

Anova Summary Using Similarity of Function and the Perceptual Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Dominant function similarity	1	53.037	.098
Auxiliary function similarity	1	2189.137	4.063*
2-Way interaction of dominant and auxiliary functions	1	14.660	.027
Error	93	538.781	

*p .05

These tables show there is no significant relationship between similarity of dominant functions or interaction of dominant and auxiliary functions and roommate satisfaction. However there is a significant relationship

between the auxiliary function and the Perceptual Problem score. Roommates who prefer opposite auxiliaries have lower mean Perceptual Problem score than those who prefer the same auxiliary, therefore are more satisfied with their roommates. This means this hypothesis can be rejected only when the dependent variable is the Perceptual Problem score and the independent variable is the similarity of the auxiliary function.

Hypothesis two

There will be no significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of the number of functions shared by roommates.

In this hypothesis only the number of functions (S-N and T-F) that each pair has in common is used to determine the groups for the independent variable and the two problem scores are used as the dependent variable. Tables three and four give the results of two 1X3 analyses of variance using the shared functions and the problem scores.

Table 3

Anova Summary for the Number of Functions Shared and Roommate Satisfaction

as Measured by the Behavioral Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Number of shared functions	2	148.781	.735
Error	95	202.33	

Table 4

Anova Summary for the Number of Functions Shared and Roommate Satisfaction

as Measured by the Perceptual Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Number of shared functions	2	553.646	1.022
Error	95	547.685	

There is no significant relationship between the number of shared functions and roommate satisfaction as measured by both parts of the questionnaire so hypothesis two can not be rejected.

Hypothesis three

There will not be a significant difference in roommate satisfaction as a function of preferences shared.

In this hypothesis the independent variable is the number of preferences (E-I, S-N, T-F, J-P) shared by the roommates which range from zero preferences alike to all four preferences the same. The dependent variables are the two problem scores. Tables five and six give the results of two 1X5 analyses of variance using all four preferences and the two problem scores.

Table 5

Anova Summary Using Preferences Shared and Roommate Satisfaction

as Measured by the Behavioral Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Number of shared preferences	4	219.005	1.092
Error	93	200.495	

Table 6

Anova Summary Using Preferences Shared and Roommate Satisfaction

as Measured by the Perceptual Problem Score

Source	df	MS	F
Number of shared preferences	4	1713.666	3.486*
Error	93	491.534	

*p = .01

There is no significant relationship between the number of shared prefer-ences and roommate satisfaction as measured by the Behavioral Problem score. However, when using the Perceptual Problem score there is a significant difference. Further testing using the quadratic trend (orthogonal poly-nomial), which yields an $F_{(4, 93)}$ = 148.35, p = .001, shows that the relationship between similarity and satisfaction is non-linear with those sharing one, two, or three preferences tending to be more satisfied than those sharing zero or four preferences.

Hypothesis four

There will be no significant correlation between roommate satisfaction and similarity of types as measured by continuous global similarity score.

Unlike the first three hypotheses which use dichotomous socres of the MBTI, hypothesis four uses a global similarity score (obtained by summing the differences of the continuous scores of each preference for the room-mates) as the independent variable. Table seven gives the results of using two Pearson Product-Moment Correlations to correlate the global simi-larity scores with the two problem scores.

Table 7

The Correlations of Global Similarity Scores and Problem Scores

	Roommate satisfaction as measured by Behav-ioral Problem score	Roommate satisfaction as measured by Percept-ual Problem score
Global similarity score	.1615	.2914*

*p = .02

There is no significant correlation between global similarity score and roommate satisfaction as measured by the Behavioral Problem score but there is a significant correlation when the Perceptual Problem score is used as the measure of satisfaction. The means the hypothesis can be rejected only when the dependent variable is the Perceptual Problem score. In this case those who are similar tend to be more satisfied with their roommates than those who are different.

Hypothesis five

There will be no significant correlation between roommate satisfaction and perceived similarity between roommates.

In this hypothesis the independent variable is the perceived similarity score (derived by summing perceived differences in self and roommate; see part two of the questionnaire). Table eight gives the results of two Pearson Product-Moment Correlations involving the perceived similarity score and the problem scores.

Table 8

The Correlations between Perceived Similarity Scores and Problem Scores

	Behavioral problem score	Perceptual problem score
Perceived similarity score	.5027*	.3805*

*p = .001

There is a significant correlation between the perceived similarity among roommates and roommate satisfaction as measure by both problem scores, with those perceiving themselves as being similar to their roommates tending to be more satisfied with the relationship. Consequently, hypothesis five can be rejected. This is the only hypothesis which can be rejected when the Behavioral Problem score is the dependent variable.

Discussion

The overall results of this study show that roommate type similarity as measured by the MBTI does not significantly relate to roommate satisfaction if the instrument used to measure satisfaction deals with problems resulting from differences in behaviors such as smoking, study habits and willingness to discuss problems and academic interests (see part one of the questionnaire, the first 26 questions). This means that those who are different have an equal chance of being satisfied with their roommates as do those who are similar. This is true regardless of how similarity is defined. Similarity is measured in this study by dichotomous scores using the number of shared functions, by the number of shared preferences, or by continuous scores which take into consideration the strength of the preferences.

Results are mixed when roommate satisfaction is measured by roommates ratings of how much perceived similarity or difference in personality characteristics affected their relationship. When similarity is measured by the total number of shared functions there is no significant difference in roommate satisfaction (defined by both problem scores). However when using total type preferences (dichotomous scores) and the strength of preference (continuous scores) as the measure of similarity, there is a significant difference as a function of similarity. Those who are similar as measured by actual MBTI scores or those who perceive themselves to be similar as measured by part two of the questionnaire, are more satisfied with their roommate.

The results of each hypothesis will be presented, followed by a discussion of the limitations of this study and the implications for future research.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis one. This hypothesis was developed in order to compare results of this study with two that had been completed previously. Schroeder (Note 3, 1976) suggests that complementary pairing of students (common dominant functions and opposite auxiliary functions) enhances roommate compatibility. Schroeder does not discuss in his paper a definition of compatibility. He does say that he believes if pairs share their primary way of functioning (dominant function) then they will have a common ground for understanding each other, thus increasing their chances for being compatible. He believes having opposite auxiliaries is beneficial because it allows the

roommates to learn from and to appreciate a different style of functioning. Results of hypothesis three, which will be discussed later, support Schroeder's idea that it is best for compatibility to share some but not all preferences. The results of this study do not support the idea that it is the dominant function that should be similar but does support the idea that having opposite auxiliaries does tend to result in greater roommates satisfaction. This is only true when satisfaction is measured by the Perceptual Problem score.

Hypothesis two. A natural extension of this finding is to consider the total number of shared functions without regard to dominance. Hypothesis two was developed to investigate if sharing a different number of functions (zero, one, or two) affects roommate satisfaction. Eigenbrod (1969) found that those sharing at least one function were more satisfied than those sharing none. The results of this study do not support his findings as there is no significant difference between groups in the amount of satisfaction reported as measured by either problem score. Since Eigenbrod's study, like Schroeder's, involved more than one independent variable (both made physical changes in the environment), it maybe that the significance he obtained resulted more from an interaction affect than simply the pairing of roommates who share at least one function. It is clear that in this study, which did not involve any manipulations of the environment or deliberate roommate pairing by personality, that the sharing of a certain number of functions does not affect roommate satisfaction.

Hypothesis three. This hypothesis is based on the theory that intimate relationships have a greater chance of being sustained if the pairs share one, two, or three preferences than if they share zero or four. If no preferences are shared there will be no common way of relating to the world, which would greatly increase potential for misunderstandings and conflicts. On the other hand two people who are totally similar in preferences are likely to be underdeveloped in the same areas and will experience difficulties when these underdeveloped functions or attitudes are needed. A balance between similarity and difference (one, two, or three preferences the same) offers a greater chance for mutual understanding in areas of similarity and complementation in areas of opposites. Hypothesis three is not supported by this study when the Behavioral Problem score is the measure of satisfaction. However the hypothesis is supported when the Perceptual Problem score is used. Using the means and standard deviations (see Appendix C, table A) and the results of the quadratic trend test ($\underline{F}(4, 93) = 148.35$, $\underline{p} = .001$), it is concluded that the pairs of students with one, two, or three common preferences have significantly higher satisfaction than those sharing zero or four preferences. Therefore these results support the theory that greater satisfaction results from an intermediate number of similar preferences. However, the lack of significant results using the Behavioral Problem score means there is a discrepancy. Some possible explanation of this are

1. the difference in personality characteristics are seen by roommates as being more crucial than behaviors in determining compatibility

2. behaviors can be changed easier than characteristics and since the instruments were administered after the students had lived together for some time, they might have altered their behavior so that they were more compatible.

3. choices on the behavioral part of the questionnaire range from no effect to strongly negative while on the perceptual, they range from frequently positive to frequently negative. If the roommates had been allowed some positive choices on the behavioral part of the qeustionnaire, then significant results might have been obtained.

Until further study is done to find the source of this discrepancy, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that there is a non-linear relationship between the number of shared preferences and roommate satisfaction as measured by problems resulting from perceived differences in personality characteristics: with those in the middle of the range of shared preferences (one, two, or three) being more satisfied than those on the extremes (zero and four).

Hypothesis four. Researchers have disagreed on the appropriateness of using bimodial scores because the reliability of these scores are generally not as high as they are for continuous scores. For this reason hypothesis four, unlike the first three, uses continuous scores to measure the degree of similarity of roommates. The results are very similar to those found for hypothesis three: no significance is found when using the Behavioral Problem score but there is a significant positive correlation when the Perceptual Problem score is used. The correlation which is a linear measure suggests that only about 10% of the variance can be attributed to the

relationship between similarity and satisfaction; however it should be noted that the results of hypothesis three indicate that the relationship is probably non-linear. It is possible that if a non-linear method of analysis were used, there would have been evidence of a relationship between similarity and satisfaction.

As to the question of whether or not bimodial or continuous scores should be used in research, this study does not support the use of one over the other as similar results were obtained using both types of scores (see hypothesis three and four).

Hypothesis five. This hypothesis was used because studies by others (Kelly, 1941; Nudd, 1965; and Broxton, 1971) contend that satisfaction between pairs is not as dependent on objective facts such as scores on various tests as on expectations and perceived similarities. This hypothesis does not use the objective instrument, MBTI, but rather a phenomenological instrument (perceptions of self and roommate). Only on this hypothesis are there significant findings when both problem scores are used. This result supports the idea that the perception of a difference is more crucial than an objective difference as measured by MBTI. There are moderate correlations between both problem scores and perceived similarity in personality characteristics: those who perceive themselves as being similar to their roommates tend to see this similarity as having a positive effect on the relationship.

In conclusion, the results indicate that pairing of students by similarity of preferences as measured by MBTI produces more roommate satisfaction only if the roommates perceive themselves to be similar. The results also

suggest that it is important to consider all preferences (as in hypotheses three and four) rather than just functions (as in hypotheses one and two) when considering satisfaction between roommates.

Limitations of this study

Population. The population of this study had a high frequency of two types (ENFP and INFP made up 37% of the population) and a high proportion of those prefering feeling to thinking (74 to 24). Because of this, certain pairings occurred more frequently than would be expected by chance. (See Appendix C, table B for the breakdown of types.) Many different pairings are desirable since there may be certain patterns of type similarity which get along better than other.

The groups used for the analyses of variance were of varying sizes with some having very few members. This means that the results, based on very few cases, are not as valid as they would be for larger and more varied population. For breakdown of group sizes see Appendix C, tables C, D, and E.

Questionnaire. This was not a standardized questionnaire so there are no reliability or validity data available. It was assumed that each part of the questionnaire measured the degree of roommate satisfaction but there is only a moderate correlation between the two problem scores ($r(97)$ = .4278, p = .001) which suggests that they only partially measure the same thing. There is no way to determine from this study which score more accurately reflects true roommate satisfaction.

Administration of the questionnaire. Another problem is when the questionnaire was administered. If was near the end of the semester and

the students were feeling the pressure of exams and papers. Some of those who answered the questionnaire seemed not to have taken it very seriously as they marked the same choice on almost all the questions.

Summary and implications for further research

The important factor in the degree of roommate satisfaction does not seem to be the pairing of certain types but rather how students perceive themselves and their roommate. If one perceives onself to be quite different than one's roommate than there seems to be a greater chance of dissatisfaction.

Hypothesis five uses a different instrument to measure type and the results deviated from those for the hypotheses using the actual MBTI types. The correlations between actual MBTI scores and perceived MBTI scores with the two measures of roommate satisfaction produced interesting differences. Those who perceive themselves to be similar when using the personality descriptions on the questionnaire and the forced choices of the MBTI may show a positive correlation between satisfaction and similarity because they have a clearer understanding of themselves. While others who perceive themselves as different on the two instruments may give mixed results because they are less consistent in perceptions and needs.

The question concerning which part of the questionnaire more accurately measures roommate satisfaction could be accomplished if both parts were correlated with an instrument which has been validated as a measure of satisfaction.

This study only isolated the functions. The crucial differences may lie in the similarity or difference in E-I or J-P preferences. Another study might consider these preferences separately.

Future studies need to include people who are more equally distributed among the possible types. Also some effort needs to be made to sample from multiple combinations of type pairing.

This study used a total problem score to represent roommate satisfaction. It maybe that when an analysis is done on certain problems it will be found that certain type pairings result in high dissatisfaction over certain issues or behaviors. This result could be useful in counseling students so that potential problems might be avoided. Roommates may be able to guard against potential problems and learn how to use their differences to enhance their relationship.

A final word of caustion: the MBTI was not designed to predict satisfaction or dissatisfaction but rather to supply people with information about how they function, their strengths, potential weaknesses, and differences from other types. Hopefully having this information will increase their ability to positively relate to others who have similar or different preferences.

Reference Notes

1. Grant, W. H. Behavior of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator types (Research Report). Auburn Ala.: Auburn University, Student Counseling Service, 1965.

2. Ross, J. The relationship between Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and ability, personality, and information tests (Research Bulletin 63-5). Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

3. Schroeder, C. C. Territoriality and the group system; two milieu management strategies for promoting student development in residence halls (Research Report). Auburn, Ala.: Auburn University, 1976.

4. Schmidt, D. K., & Sedlacek, W. E. Academic performance and homogeneity of roommates (Research Report). College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1968.

References

Arnold, W. M. Compatibility and stability in roommate relationships (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 1974, 34(8B), 4012. (University Microfilms No. 74-3571)

Bouchard, T. J., Jr. Personality, problem solving procedure, and performance in small groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1969, 53(1, pt. 2), 1-29.

Brown, R. D. Manipulation of the environmental press in a college residence hall. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1968, 46, 555-560.

Broxton, J. A. Interpersonal attraction factors involved in roommate satisfaction among college freshman (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1962). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1970, 31(4B), 2252. (University of Kentucky Library)

Carlson, R., & Levy, N. Brief method for assessing social-personal orientation. *Psychology Reports*, 1968, 23, 911-914.

Cattell, R., & Nesselroade, J. Likeness and completeness theories examined by 16 PF measures on stable and unstable married couples. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 1967, 7, 351-361.

Collins, J. A. Individual personality and organizational climate (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1965). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, 27, 623A. (University Microfilms No. 66-3361)

Crew, J. L., & Giblette, J. F. Academic performance of freshman males as a function of residence hall housing. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1965, 6, 167-170.

DeCoster, D. C. Housing assignments for high ability students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1966, 7, 19-22.

DeCoster, D. C. Effects of homogeneous housing assignments for high ability students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1968, 9, 75-78.

Eigenbrod, F. S., Jr. The effect of territory and personality compatibility on identity and security (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1969, 30, 2329A. (University Microfilms No. 69-20, 849)

Elton, C. F., & Bates, U. S. The effect of housing policy on grade-point average. *Journal of College Personnel*, 1966, 7, 73-77.

Garrison, N. Instructor student compatability: A study of effects of personality similarity on academic performance (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 31, 5199A. (University Microfilms No. 71-10, 373)

Gehring, D. D. Prediction of roommate compatibility. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1970, 11, 58-61.

Girard, F. G. The interaction of perceptual discrimination, aesthetic preference and personality traits (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1967). *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1968, 28, 2554A. (University Microfilms No. 68-395)

Grass, P. L. Differential effects of short term small-group interaction on the behavioral development of college freshman according to personality type (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1971, 32, 196A. (University Microfilms No. 71-18, 211)

Helton, W. B. A comparative analysis of selected characteristics of intellectually superior male students who persist and those who do not

persist in an advanced placement program (Doctoral disseration, North Texas State University, 1964). Dissertation Abstract, 1964, 25, 3394. (University Microfilms No. 71-9641)

Hoffman, J. L. Personality relationships between supervising teachers and student teachers as determined by the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36(02), 830-831A. (University Microfilms No. 75-16, 393)

Jones, H. T. The relationship of counselor-client personality to counseling process and outcome (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 29, 2962A. (University Microfilms No. 29-3390)

Kelly, E. L. Marital compatibility as related to personality traits of husbands and wives as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 193-198.

Lucasse, P. R. The effect of certain personality variables within the student teacher - cooperating teacher dyad on the outcomes of student teaching experience (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6272A. University Microfilms No. 72-14, 929)

Marshall, N. J. Orientation toward privacy: Environmental and personality components (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 4315B. (University Microfilms No. 71-815)

Mendelsohn, G. A. Effects of client personality and client-counselor similarity on the duration of counseling: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13(2), 228-232.

Mendelsohn, G. A. Client-counselor compatibility and the effectiveness of counseling. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 019 687)

Mendelsohn, G. A., & Geller, M. H. Effects of counselor-client similarity on the outcome of counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10(1), 71-77.

Mendelsohn, G. A., & Geller, M. H. Structure of client attitudes toward counseling and their relation to client-counselor similarity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29(1), 63-72.

Mendelsohn, G. A., & Geller, M. H. Similarity, missed sessions, and early termination. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14(3), 210-215.

Mendelsohn, G. A., & Kirk, B. A. Personality differences between students who do and do not use a counseling facility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9(4), 341-346.

Miller, P. Personality differences and student survival in law school. Journal of Legal Education, 1967, 19, 460-468.

Moos, R. H. Conceptualizations of human environments. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 652-665.

Morris, R. P. A comparative analysis of selected characteristics of intellectually superior female students who persisted and those who did not persist in an advanced placement program (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts, 1964 25, 3402-3403. (University Microfilms No. 64-10, 746)

Martray, C. R. An empirical investigation into learning styles and retention patterns of various personality types (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, 32(9A), 5043A. (University Microfilms No. 72-8451)

Myers, I. B. *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.

Nasater, D. A contextual analysis of academic failure. *School Review*, 1963, 71(3), 290-298.

Neville, W. G. An analysis of personality types and their differential response to marital enrichment groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1972, 32, 6766A. (University Microfilms No. 72-16, 640)

Nudd, T. R. Satisfied and dissatisfied college roommates. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1965, 6, 161-166.

Pace, L. T. Roommate dissatisfaction in a college residence hall as related to roommate scholastic achievement, The College and University Environment Scales and Edwards Personnel Preference Schedule (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1967). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 1968, 28(8A), 2989A. (University Microfilms No. 68-447)

Pierce, R. A. Roommate satisfaction as a function of need similarity. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1970, 11, 355-358.

Pierce, R. A., & Schwartz, A. J. Value similarity and satisfaction in suite type living arrangements. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1974, 15(3), 213-219.

Poe, C. A. Assessment of Heath's model of personality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1968, 15, 203-207.

Rechek, H. Note on intercorrelations of scales of the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. *Psychological Reports*, 1969, 25(1), 28-30.

Rohner, R. P. Proxemics and stress: An empirical study of relationship between living space and roommate turnover. *Human Relations*, 1974, 27(7), 697-702.

Scheidt, F. J., & Smith, M. D. Birth order, compatibility and same-sex dyads; a replication. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1976, 99(2), 291-292.

Schroeder, C. C. New strategies for structuring residential environments. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1976, 17, 386-390.

Siegel, L. Test reviews. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1963, 10, 307.

Smith, A. *A new strategy for improving college teaching*. Lake City, Fla.: The International Creativity Center, Inc., 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 305)

Snead, R. G., & Cople, R. B. Some effects of environment press in university housing. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1971, 12, 189-192.

Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. An assessment of some structural properties of the Jungian personality typology. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, 68(1), 62-71.

Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. Intercorrelation and reliability of *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* scales. *Psychology Reports*, 1963, 12, 287.

Stricker, L. J., & Ross, J. Some correlates of a Jungian personality inventory. *Psychology Reports*, 1964, 12, 623.

Stricker, L. J., Schiffman, H., & Ross, J. Prediction of college per-

formance with the <u>Myers-Briggs</u> <u>Type</u> <u>Indicator</u>. <u>Educational</u> <u>and</u> <u>Psy-</u>

<u>chological</u> <u>Measurement</u>, 1965, <u>25</u>, 1081-1095.

Sundberg, N. <u>Sixth</u> <u>mental</u> <u>measurement</u> <u>yearbook</u>. Highland Park, N. J.:

Gryphon Press, 1965, 322-325.

Tellem, I. L. Measurement of roommate compatibility as related to sim-

ilarity of roommates characteristics and adjustment to college (Doc-

toral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1968). <u>Dissertation</u>

<u>Abstract</u>, 1969, <u>29</u>(12A), 4558. (University Microfilms No. 69-9528)

Volkwein, J. F. Freshman roommates: Random vs. matched pairs. <u>Journal</u>

<u>of</u> <u>College</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Personnel</u>, 1966, <u>7</u>(3), 145-146.

Wheaton, B. Interpersonal conflict and cohesiveness in dyadic relation-

ships. <u>Sociometry</u>, 1974, <u>37</u>(3), 328-348.

Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. R. The impact of residence halls on

students. <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>College</u> <u>Students</u> <u>Personnel</u>, 1972, <u>13</u>(5), 702-710.

Appendix A

ROOMMATE QUESTIONNAIRE
Part One

The following are some problems people have expressed they have had with

their roommates. Please circle the word which best describes how frequently

you felt the behavior listed resulted in a problem for you and your roommate.

1. one or both of us smoking (cigarettes, pipe, or cigars)
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

2. one or both of us smoking pot
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

3. one or both of us using drugs or drinking alcohol
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

4. one or both of our friends being in the room too much
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

5. one or both of our girl/boy friends sleeping in the room
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

6. one or both of us not liking the other's friends
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

7. one or both of us talking too much
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

8. one or both of us feeling the lack of privacy
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

9. our having differences in needs for orderliness in the room
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

10. one or both of us making noise which disturbs the other's sleep or studying
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

11. our study hours are different
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

12. our interests are different
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

13. one or both of us uses things without asking permission of the other
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

14. one or both of us borrow things and does not return them promptly
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

15. one or both of us do not respect the other's rights
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

16. our study patterns are not the same (eg. one likes music on, the other does not; one needs more hours to study; both are use to studying at different times of the day)
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

17. we do not talk; we argue
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

18. we cannot discuss academic ideas and problems
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very foten   e. almost all the time

19. we cannot discuss social problems
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

20. we cannot share our feelings
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

21. one or both of us cannot discuss openly and honestly problems we have with each other
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

22. one or both of us has ideosyncracies which are bother some to the other (eg. body odor, tics, snapping gum, snoring)
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

23. our general outlook on life (liberal verses conservative) is not the same
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

24. our moral/religious views are not the same
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

25. our ages are different
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

26. our academic interests (majors, courses being taken) are not the same
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

27. I have been rooming with this person
a. 1 or less months   b. 1 to 2 months   c. 2 to 3 months   d. all semester
                      e. more than a semester

28. I have had this many roommates this semester
a. 1   b. 2   c. 3   d. 4   e. 5

29 This roommate was
a. assigned to me   b. requested by me

30. In an overall rating would you say your present roommate is one you would
a. truly love to have as a roommate
b. pick to live with as much as a few other you know
c. find it OK to live with but the idea is not exciting
d. consider living with but only if some problems were cleared up
e. never pick to live with again

31. I consider my roommate
a. one of my closest friends with whom I share alot
b. a good friend
c. as much of a friend as other I know
d. somewhat of a friend
e. not a friend

32. The whole dorm atmosphere is conducive to studying
a. never   b. seldom   c. sometimes   d. very often   e. almost all the time

33. I would choose to live in East Hall over
a. all other dorms   b. most other dorms   c. some other dorms
               d. few other dorms   e. no other dorms

34. I am finding the Watauga College experience to be
a. much more satisfying than I had expected
b. more satisfying than I had expected
c. about as satisfying as I had expected
d. less satisfying than I had expected
e. much less satisfying than I had expected

35. I am finding my experience at ASU to be
a. much more satisfying than I had expected
b. more satisfying than I had expected
c. about as satisfying as I had expected
d. less satisfying than I had expected
e. much less satisfying than I had expected

36. If I had my choice I would chose to room alone
a. yes   b. no

Please fill in the blanks

37. your age_____

38. your sex_____

39. your classification (freshman, sophomore, etc.)_____

ROOMMATE QUESTIONNAIRE
Part Two

Please use these scales to rate each item which is in the column below it.
Circle the letter which fits best.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON	MYSELF	ROOMMATE	EFFECT
	How often I am like the description	How often my roommate is like the description	How I feel this difference or similarity effects our relationship
	a. never b. seldom c. sometimes d. very often e. all the time	a. never b. seldom c. sometimes d. very often e. all the time	a. frequently positively b. occassionally positively c. not at all d. ocassionally negatively e. frequently negatively

1. realistic and practical   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

2. imaginative, original, and individualistic   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

3. firm minded and determined   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

4. sentimental and devoted   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

5. systematic and orderly   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

6. spontaneous and like to be unplanned   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

7. lively, enthusiastic, talkative   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

8. calm and detached   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

9. like to build and deal with concrete thing   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

10. like to invent and come up with new ideas   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

11. in making decisions lets the heart rule the head   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

12. in making decisions lets the head rule the heart   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

13. likes to arrive at decisions   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

14. likes dealing with unexpected   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

15. easy to get to know   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

16. had to get to know   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

17. likes certainity and likes to do thing in an established way   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d ee

18. has visions of the future and possibilities   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

19. interested in causes and effects and like to analyze   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

20. sympathetic and concerned with mercy   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

21. organized and like routine   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

22. impulsive, likes constant change, and does things at the last minute   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

23. like to party   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

24. likes to write or do other quiet things by self   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

25. sensible   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

26. like theories   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

27. careful when people's rights are involved   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

28. gentle and kind   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

29. like to operate with a schedule and plans so he/she does not have to get things done at the last minute   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

30. easy going   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

31. shares feelings frequently
    with close friends   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

32. shares feeling with close
    friends only if he/she has
    some special reason to   a b c d e   a b c d e   a b c d e

Appendix B

Consent Form

I agree to fill out a five page questionnaire that will be used by Margaret
Wentworth in her masters thesis. I also give her permission to use the
results on my Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. I am aware that no where in the
study will my name appear and that measures have been taken to maintain
confidentiality. I also am aware that my participation in this study will
be helpful to the Watauga College staff in making the living situation
more supportive for the students.

Please check one and sign your name.

I agree to the above._____   _____

I do not want to participate in this study._____   _____

Appendix C

Table A

Means and Standard Deviations of Perceptual Problem Scores

for Groups Determined by Number of Shared Preferences

Number of shared preferences	Means	SD
0	110.857	47.705
1	82.684	23.034
2	78.731	21.127
3	83.875	17.980
4	93.643	10.104
Total	85.6020	23.2795

Table B

Breakdown of <u>MBTI</u> Types in the Population of this Study

ENFP	ENFJ	ESFP	ESFJ
20%	3%	7%	7%
ENTP	ENTJ	ESTP	ESTJ
4%	3%	3%	1%
INFP	INFJ	ISFP	ISFJ
16%	2%	6%	7%
INTP	INTJ	ISTP	ISTJ
5%	2%	1%	5%

Table C

Breakdown of the Population Used in Hypothesis One

	Same dominant	Different dominant
Same auxiliary	18	8
Different auxiliary	18	54

Table D

Breakdown of Population Used in Hypothesis Two

Functions shared by roommates	Number in each group
0	18
1	46
2	34

Table E

Breakdown of Population Used in Hypothesis Three

Preferences shared by roommates	Number in each group
0	6
1	20
2	26
3	32
4	14